

Organizing for Societal Security and Crisis Management: Building Governance Capacity and Legitimacy (GOVCAP)

Introduction

This project studies *governance capacity* and *governance legitimacy* for societal security and crisis management. It addresses two main research themes in the call: a) Cooperation, management and organization, and b) Social structures, values and trust. The overall research question is: What makes a well performing governmental crisis management system? A well performing administrative structure needs both organizational capacity and legitimacy. The project examines the organization and coordination of public resources, decision-making systems and governance tools; and the relevance of public perceptions and attitudes toward societal security, safety and resilience. The trade-off between the capacity for resilience and for emergency preparedness as well as the balance between societal security and individual rights is central. A general theory of how crises best can be managed, and with what type of organization, does not exist. There is a need of unpacking the field of societal security and crisis management into different types of management situations and crises. There are significant variations across types of crises, for example between natural disasters and terrorism. What is considered good capacity and performance, and with what tools, may vary. We explore why some cases are considered successful, while others are not, and identify relevant dimensions across different countries and cases.

The overall aim is to strengthen the knowledge base concerning pressing governance dilemmas in order to support overall societal security, safety and resilience. The project will bring forth new theoretical, methodological and empirical insight on national arrangements and trust relations within the policy area. A core focus is on how overall performance is affected by capacity and legitimacy, and how the two factors interact.

The two sets of questions are examined through two interrelated research modules. *Module 1* analyzes *governance capacity*, looking at the characteristics, the structure and performance of government authorities and instruments within the field. A main assumption is that organization and use of different governance tools will affect performance and assessment of performance. *Module 2* considers *governance legitimacy and norms*. It analyzes trust in government arrangements for crisis management and societal security, and public assessment of the governments' performance. Also, general trust among citizens and mutual trust relations between public sector organizations and between politicians and civil servants related to societal security, safety and crisis management is examined.

Being based on collaboration within a high-quality international academic research network the project has a strong focus on internationalization and a marked comparative design. It includes data from six European countries: Norway, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, Germany and the United Kingdom. A main motivation is to strengthen the capacity for evidence-based policy-making within the field and to stimulate and reinforce the recruitment of new scholars.

Background and status of knowledge

Societal security and crisis management represent a “wicked problem” where coordination between actors and organizations with different tasks and perceptions is crucial (Head 2008). These problems transcend organizational borders, policy areas and administrative levels. They are typically *complex*, involving multi-level and multi-sectoral actors and *uncertain* knowledge and *ambiguous* goals and priorities. Crises are often unpredictable, demand rapid response, and often spur considerable criticism and debate. Public organizations face important constraints in their effort to handle these complexities, being at the nexus of both democracy and governance, facing demands for capacity as well as accountability, legitimacy and representativeness.

Crises typically challenge existing patterns of organization and management; do not fit easily into established organizational contexts, and are constantly framed and reframed. Decisions on how to organize, regulate, prepare and respond to crises ultimately concern values and are therefore inherently political. Working across existing organizational borders and paying heed to multi-level governance relations and a need for collaboration as well as legitimacy concerns is crucial. An increased emphasis within the public sector on inter-organizational coordination, network solutions and reforms such as whole-of-government influences also this policy area (Christensen and Læg Reid 2007, Osborne 2009). Relevant issues are how useful governance tools for performance control, oversight, accountability and transparency are.

Organizing for societal security and crisis management within the public sector entails possible conflicts between different sets of administrative values. Three core sets of values are central (Hood 1991). An organization is supposed to be *lean and purposeful*, focusing on efficiency, economy and parsimony, it should be *honest and fair*, emphasizing impartiality, neutrality and trust, and it should be *robust and resilient*, focusing on security, reliability, survival, adaptivity, trust and legitimacy. It is hard to satisfy all values within one administrative design. Different solutions are available, with different expectations and effects attached. Economy and frugality is important but so is also fairness and organizational resilience. Societal security and safety also entail dilemmas between other crucial values. After 9/11 many countries introduced new security measures against terrorism, fuelling debates about the balance between democratic and societal values on the one hand and a demand for increased protection on the other (Etzioni 2004, Kuzma 2004, Fimreite et al. 2013). This project aims to examine the impact of and specific solutions to these dilemmas and tensions in different settings.

Theories of crisis development and management are primarily descriptive, and often prescriptive. Our project builds on existing research on challenges regarding how to manage and build capacity to handle transboundary crises (Boin 2008, Boin, Busuic and Groeneleer 2013). The politics of crisis management related to sensemaking, decisionmaking, meaningmaking, coordination, accountability and learning is central (Boin et al. 2005, Boin et al. 2008, Ansell et al. 2010). Building resilient organizations is a core topic (Wildavsky 1988), and the question of the relation between organizational characteristics, processes and resilience needs more exploration (Boin and van Eeten 2012). The relationship between prevention, preparation, response and recovery is essential, and the capacity to act upon and recover from crisis and emergencies is a core question (Weick and Sutcliff 2001). Moreover, research and debates on organizing for crisis response, management and security is central (Czarniawska, 2009, Hutter and Power 2005, Kettl 2003, Perrow 2006, Roe and Schulman 2008). Research concerning social capital, public trust and confidence in government arrangements for building resilience and handling societal security and safety is equally crucial (Braithwaite and Levi 2003, Aldrich 2012).

The existing literature on crisis management, emergency response and societal security is often oriented towards specific sectors and organizations or devoted to the evaluation of reactions to specific crises *ex post*. Few focus specifically on public sector arrangements in a comparative perspective. Systematic research covering experiences across different sectors, countries and public administrations and types of crises is lacking. Research taking governance and political aspects into account is also limited. Our ambition is to contribute to this line of research. An exception is the EU-project 'Analysis of Civil Security Systems in Europe' (ANVIL) (Bossong and Hegemann 2013). The project observes that it is hard to find a strong correlation between specific structural arrangements and system performance. We will build on findings from this project and analyze the relationship more in depth by performing case studies of specific types of crisis across countries as well as taking the broader institutional setting of national administrative systems into account.

Theoretical approach and research questions

The project applies a broad organization theory approach with both instrumental and institutional components and combining political science and organization theory (Olsen 2010, Christensen et al. 2007). A central argument is that societal security and crisis management are framed in specific institutional, political and organizational settings that may influence performance. The complexity, uncertainty and ambiguity of societal security and crisis management is defined and handled within and across organizations, ministerial areas and administrative levels with specific characteristics, and influenced by accountability and legitimacy issues. Crisis management is found in the interface between policy areas and administrative levels. The organizational layout of the societal security and safety field is therefore of crucial importance.

A concept of bounded rationality assumes that organizations are biased (Simon 1947). They are not neutral tools in the hands of political and administrative executives but seen as institutions, infused with values and robust in the face of new steering signals from executives and changing external pressures (Selznick 1957, March and Olsen 1989). Organization is therefore not merely a technical and logistic question, but a question of political priority, attention, coordination, capacity and legitimacy. Organizational arrangements and cultures affect prevention, preparedness and response. Citizens' attitudes towards government arrangements and trust in central institutions further influence decisions on organization and policy, and affect judgments about their success or failure. Organizations and decisions on organizational arrangements may aggravate crises, but can also reduce loss or damage. Core questions are: What can explain how different arrangements for dealing with crises develop and change? Under what conditions can crises be handled in a satisfactory manner? What governance tools are considered successful, and by which criteria?

The field of societal security and safety is upheld by a complex structure of actors and organizations, each with a substantial life of their own (Allison 1971). The ability to execute formal authority and responsibility is constrained by basic organizational dilemmas and trade-offs (Kettl 2003), and we face permanent tensions between different values and administrative doctrines (Olsen 2010, 2014), between integration and fragmentation, between prevention and resilience and between societal security and individual rights. Different types of coordination and specialization matter (Bouckaert et al. 2010), and multi-level governance influences the relations between actors (Bache and Flinders 2005). Standard operating procedures might imply sequential attention, local rationality, biased search and constraints on information, options for actions and implementation capacity (Cyert and March 1963). Organizational and institutional changes can result from a complex mixture of organizational constraints, cultural features, external shocks and deliberate executive choices (Christensen et al. 2007). Change processes might be abrupt or incremental resulting in continuity or discontinuity (Streeck and Thelen 2005), and may be related to context or path-dependent and institutionalized features (Mahoney and Thelen 2010, Krasner 1988).

A central argument is that context matters (Christensen and Lægreid 2013). Organizations are embedded in institutional contexts that provide legitimacy, and seek to comply with institutional expectations by a logic of appropriateness (March and Olsen 1989). A core question is what makes an effective crisis management system? How is that affected by degree of fragmentation/integration, centralization/decentralization, and coordination/specialization? We expect that variations across countries are partly dependent on national risk, which is a combination of exposure and vulnerability to hazard, but also affected by administrative culture, polity features, and public assessment of government performance. We expect variations across type of crisis: whether man-made or natural, narrow or transboundary, small or incomprehensible or 'routine'-like. A focus on natural disasters and terrorism will provide

cases that vary according to capacity (high/low) and legitimacy (high/low). We expect performance to vary according to such features.

Two modules: Governance capacity and governance legitimacy

Module 1 examines the effects of *governance capacity* on crisis management performance in selected European countries. The core question is how to enhance problem-solving capacity to deal with crises, terrorist attacks and disasters. Efficiency, effectiveness, resilience, performance and implementation power is fundamental. We will map the existing and emerging organizational arrangements within the public sector to handle these issues in a multilevel government system, with a special focus on the central government and strategic level. We ask what the main organizational forms and governance tools for dealing with different types of crisis are, how they have developed and changed over the past 10 years, and how the selected organizational forms and instruments have been able to handle crises in the past. Under what conditions have they developed, and what are the main challenges and advantages in their operation? We will further examine variations in national risk and in collaboration with Module 2 their relation to organization, performance, public attitudes and trust/legitimacy.

The degree of *centralization/decentralization* and new or diverging forms of *specialization* and *coordination* developed in response to new types of risk or crises are of particular interest in Module 1. This includes the study of policy development, organizational principles, accountability relations, as well as implementation capacity and crisis management in specific cases. Relevant topics will be planning, communication, administrative culture, resilience,, legitimacy and learning. What kinds of coordinating practices and types of specialization exist or have emerged, and what is the connection between government coordinating capacity and crisis management performance?

Module 1 will examine the capacity for societal security and crisis management in the context of major public sector reforms. One main challenge is how to handle the problem of 'siloization', which tends to create significant coordination problems between sectors, administrative levels and organizations (Pollitt 2003). Within the policy area of societal security, this is seen through the creation of strong line ministries and semi-autonomous agencies with demarcated responsibility for surveillance, prevention, regulation and crisis management. A fragmented organization is especially problematic for handling transboundary and wicked problems. There is an increasing interest in reforms focusing on integration, horizontal coordination, network arrangements and stronger central government capacity. Recent European research highlights a new focus on horizontal coordination in the form of network based governance arrangements and more holistic instruments introduced to integrate the public sector (Lægneid et. al 2013). However, there is still considerable discrepancy between the attention these arrangements get and what we know about their functioning (Provan and Kenis 2007). Module 1 describes and analyzes examples of such collaborative arrangements, and identifies explanations for collaborative effectiveness in order to gain insight on how collaborative crisis management performance across different organizational settings can be improved. Hybrid organizations, including integrated organizations and permanent or temporary crisis organizations are especially interesting. The relationship between the responsible Ministry or government office with overarching coordinating and/or driving force functions on the one hand, and between strong line ministries and semi-autonomous central agencies on the other is of special interest. The grey zone between the Military and the civil sector (the Police) is one example where sector interests may conflict.

Another crucial topic is the relationship between structure and culture (Fimreite et al. 2012). In Norway the 22 July Commission mainly saw the failure of crisis preparedness and crisis management as a cultural problem (NOU 2012:14). A year later, a Commission set up to

analyze challenges for the Police mainly focused on the need for structural changes (NOU 2013:9). Neither addressed the relationship between structure and culture. Our project will reduce this knowledge gap by examining how organizational structures may constrain or enable the development of different administrative cultures, and by focusing on how specific norms and values among political executives and civil servants may constrain or enable structural changes, administrative reforms and preferred governance tools.

Module 2 examines *governance legitimacy and norms*. A representative democracy must recognize the links between governance capacity, governance legitimacy and norms. Citizens' attitudes and reactions to crises can constrain structural arrangements and realistically available governance tools. Governance norms influence the scope of government and how individual freedom and societal security is balanced. Only by combining capacity, legitimacy and norms can one get a comprehensive knowledge base for how to organize for societal security. Module 2 will therefore feed into the findings of Module 1, and vice versa. In this module, citizens' attitudes are at the center of attention. Hence, we are interested in identifying factors that may account for variation in citizens' beliefs in their governments' capacity for providing societal security as well as crisis management.

Module 2 further considers governance representativity, how crises affect legitimacy, and how responsive different public authorities are to citizens' demands in this area (Christensen et al. 2009). A key assumption is that citizens' attitudes are affected by perceived security risks in their particular environment, further that the individual-level attitudes are affected by contextual-level factors. In order to link crisis experience and considerations of risk to citizen attitudes, our aim is to use governments' own risk assessments as a predictor of public attitudes toward government. We assume that a greater security risk (as expressed in official reports) will lead to a more critical citizenry. Effects of contextual factors will be explored both within one country (variation between municipalities in Norway) and between countries.

The analysis of trust in government represents one crucial aspect of public attitudes. Thus, we will include analyses of trust in government arrangements and institutions responsible for societal security and crisis management, and attitudes towards certain preventive measures. Trust is also assumed to be sensitive to contextual factors. Does it matter if one starts from a high-trust or a low-trust context and what is the importance of official risk assessments for the public's trust in government? What happens to the citizens' trust in government and general attitudes towards different preventive measures after a crisis?

Finally, legitimacy is not only related to risk assessments and the government's ability to deal with crises. Individual rights and civil liberties such as freedom of expression, religion, mobility, assembly and privacy, due process and non-discrimination are crucial political values in a democratic society. These rights and liberties may be in conflict with a situational imperative of security, especially during times of national threat and crisis. It is a common assumption that when the perceptions of threat increase, in particular in the aftermath of major terror attacks, liberties tend to shrink (Fimreite et al. 2013). Here, value conflicts are at the core. A main issue is security at what cost, and how to balance civil rights and rule of law against the need for societal security and safety. To what extent the relationship between security, individual rights and civil liberties is traded off against each other in different contexts, is not systematically researched. Module 2 will study what variations there are across political systems in the assessment of this trade-off, and explore whether this might depend on political processes and different external and societal events.

Data and method

The project focuses on issues of national importance and aims to strengthen evidence based knowledge by contrasting Norway to other countries. We apply a comparative approach, moving beyond single country and single case studies. *Module 1* will a) collect relevant *public*

documents in order to identify, map and perform in-depth qualitative analysis of central documents concerning risk, agenda setting, policy formulation, decision-making, implementation and evaluation of administrative reforms, and changes in the policy area, including inquiry commissions, white papers, reports and hearings related to specific crises; b) perform *a review of existing literature* on organization for societal security and crisis management in order to conduct meta-analysis and synthesizing; and c) do *in-depth qualitative interviews* with key actors (board members, political and managerial executives), supplemented by extensive interviews with experts. In each country we will select at least one crisis or disaster to be examined more in depth, focusing on organizational responses to terrorist attacks and natural disasters. In addition, we aim to d) perform a possible *survey* to the key national institutions. The different data sources are expected to provide knowledge on main issues, capacity problems, political conflicts, performance, change patterns and salience of different topics. The main units of analysis are crises analyzed within different country contexts.

The project will focus on representative democracies in Europe. The comparative approach implies a “mixed system” strategy that specifically acknowledges that there are significant differences, but also important similarities between the selected countries (Frendreis 1983). This will provide a rich database for further exploration and explanation of variation. The comparison will focus on a) main organizational structure; b) crisis response structures; c) crisis response tools d) national risk assessments and e) prevention policies. The sample consists of countries characterized by different governance doctrines and public administration attributes and traditions in the face of different types of risks. Most countries struggle to balance a need for centralization with a need for decentralized crisis response. The Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands are characterized as unitary states. Germany is a big federalist state characterized by a more decentralized structure. In contrast to the other countries, the principle of ministerial responsibility does not apply to Sweden. This results in a more integrated central government apparatus in which the central agencies report to the cabinet and not to their superior ministry. The countries have different experiences of major crises and terrorism. They also display important variations in organizational arrangements and reform trends. All have recently carried out reforms that have had an impact on the respective institutional frameworks for societal security and crisis management, but the specific orientation, scope and depth of these reforms varies considerably. These features influence governance, policy development as well as politics and administrative priorities. A general observation is that there is no single best or ‘one size-fits all’ model for societal security across the selected countries but significant variations in organizing this policy area (Bossong and Hegemann 2013). Different degrees of centralization/decentralization can be identified. Within this general pattern we will examine if there is a Scandinavian model of administration for societal security and crisis management. This will imply that we find similarities between Scandinavian countries and corresponding differences from the non-Scandinavian countries.

At the same time, some similarities seem to be present across all countries. All are high trust countries, although we expect them to vary according to organizational capacity, norms, legitimacy and attitudes towards different preventive measures. Generally the change of organizational structure in this policy area seems to happen in an incremental manner. The idea of a ‘lead agency/lead ministry’ has been a major concern, although there is variation according to where this function is located and how the model is applied (Danielsen 2013). Intermediate governance-arrangements whose principal function is to facilitate coordination between different organizations and the resort areas they are operative within have emerged, largely in the shadow of hierarchy. There is also a general development from a military focus to a stronger civilian-controlled security.

Module 2 applies a more quantitative approach relying mainly on survey data. It will also draw on the findings in Module 1. The various surveys cover citizen’s trust in governance regarding

emergency preparedness and crisis management, and attitudes towards counterterror measures such as telephone-tapping, custody without trial or random stop-and-search practices. Moreover, individual-level survey data will be merged with aggregate-level data to allow for comparison between municipalities (within Norway) as well as between countries (in Europe). Many of the research questions in the project are multi-level in nature and require innovative use of methodology. In particular, we will rely on multi-level statistical techniques that distinguish between variation and causation at different levels. We will employ the following data sources:

The Norwegian Citizen Survey is a comprehensive dataset consisting of two survey studies each including more than 11000 individual respondents. The surveys contain questions concerning service satisfaction, covering a range of public services, including questions about general trust and trust in government bodies. The high number of respondents allows us to link individual-level responses to municipal-level data. Moreover, since data in the Citizen Survey have been collected in two rounds (2009/10 and 2012/13), they allow for time-series analysis.

The Norwegian Citizen Panel was initiated by the University of Bergen in 2013, and includes approximately 5 000 individual respondents. The first as well as the third round contains a set of questions about attitudes towards potential draconian measures as well as trust in government's ability to handle various crisis scenarios. The panel structure enables us to follow individual respondents over these two measurement points. Moreover, the panel aspires to incorporate a number of survey experiments.

The *Eurobarometer* monitors the development of public opinion in all 27 EU member countries. In 2011 the Eurobarometer conducted a special study on societal security covering a wide selection of crisis-related issues, e.g. terrorism organized crime, natural and man-made disasters. The *European Social Survey* (2010) contains a number of questions that are relevant to the project, including trust in the police and courts and covers all six countries along with fourteen others.

The Norwegian Administrative Survey (Administrasjonssurveyen) has data on the civil servants in Norwegian ministries and central agencies. The survey taps civil servants' attitudes towards government emergency preparedness and crisis management capacity as well as trade-offs between security and civil rights. This survey will be conducted in 2016, which will provide possibilities for comparison with data from a similar survey from 2006.

We will also make use of the Norwegian Directorate for Civil Protection's *local government survey* and data from the Quality of Government Institute, University of Gothenburg as well as other data sets on 'country risk ratings'. Such data sets allow a link between systemic-level measures and individual level data. The local government survey has been conducted on an annual basis since 2002 and contains a range of indicators of exposedness to various types of crises as well as of local authorities' capacity to handle potential crises. *The Quality of Government* data set consists of a wide array of variables measuring political stability at country level, e.g. indicators of safety and security as well as potential risks such as terrorism and corruption.

The project plan, project management, organization and cooperation

The project has an integrated design and aims to link research questions, theoretical approach, methodological design and data in a coherent way. Professor Per Læg Reid will be project leader. The project will connect internationally and nationally renowned researchers. Module 1 on governance capacity will be led by Per Læg Reid. Module 2 on governance legitimacy and norms will be led by Senior Researcher Dag Arne Christensen. Post doc and Senior Researcher Lise H. Rykkja will serve as Project Manager and main coordinator. The project group,

including the international partners, will meet regularly to discuss methodology, progress and findings.

The executive team brings together highly profiled and seasoned scholars from prestigious research institutions in six countries. They have a strong reputation in conducting and running big externally funded comparative international research programs on administrative reforms and a longstanding experience of working together in previous joint research efforts. Recent examples of this includes an evaluation of the Norwegian welfare administration reform and *Reforming the Welfare State: Democracy, Accountability and Management*, both funded by the Norwegian Research Council, Comparative research into current trends in public sector organizations (CRIPO) and the Comparative Public Organization Data Base for Research and Analysis (COBRA). One of the work packages in the EU-funded project Coordination for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future (COCOPS) focused on emerging coordinating arrangements in 11 European countries across different policy areas. In GOVCAP we will narrow the focus to in-depth studies of societal security in a selected number of countries. The project “Multilevel Governance in the Tension Between Functional and Territorial Specialization” focused on organization for societal security and crisis management in Norway (headed by Lægreid and with Rykkja as a main researcher). These projects represent a solid knowledge base on public sector reform, on organization for societal security and crisis management in particular, and on how to run big international comparative research projects.

The project will cooperate closely with five outstanding international research institutions: The National Defense College (CRISMART) in Stockholm (Scientific leader Fredrik Bynander), the Department of Political Science – Copenhagen University (Professor Martin Marcussen), School of Governance – Utrecht University (Professor Arjen Boin), Potsdam University (Professor Werner Jann) and London School of Economics (Professor Martin Lodge). This is a very strong international team of scholars in the field of societal security and public governance. The international partners will be responsible for describing and analyzing national risk and the organizational development in their own country in this policy area. They will also provide at least one case study of a specific crisis or disaster, and partake in common project activities and meetings.

The core of the research team is located in Bergen with a tight collaboration between Department of Administration and Organization Theory and the Uni Rokkan Centre. Organization for societal security and crisis management is a significant research topic at the Department of Administration and Organization Theory. A research group dedicated to research on societal security and safety and crisis management has been operational for several years, headed by Professor Lægreid. Rykkja is currently a Post doc at the department on leave from her permanent position as Senior researcher at Uni Rokkan. The Department recently employed two PhD fellows, supervised by Lægreid, who will focus their research on this topic. Uni Rokkan has a distinct multidisciplinary and inter-faculty character and is a renowned Norwegian social science institute. There is a strong tradition of collaboration between the two institutions, resulting in joint projects and publications. One relevant example is the book *Organisering, samfunnssikkerhet og krisehåndtering (Organizing, societal security and crisis management)*, with Lægreid and Rykkja as two of the co-editors (Universitetsforlaget 2011, 2nd ed. 2014). Adding to this the project will collaborate with relevant researchers at the Faculty of Law at UoB (Professor Erling J. Husabø).

Nationally, professor Tom Christensen at the University of Oslo will be a partner in the project. We are also collaborating with IRIS and the University of Stavanger (Kåre Hansen, Odd Einar Olsen, Ole Andreas Engen). Furthermore, a PhD student (Christin Watne) in Criminology at University of Oslo focusing on performance management in the police and a PhD student in public administration (Nils Kvilvang) focusing on the collaboration between the military and

the police will be affiliated to the project. Tor Stafsnes (cand. polit) will be linked to the project group (mainly Module 2) in the capacity of advisor. He has been deputy county governor in Finnmark for 25 years and has first-rate competence on regional and local security issues.

Budget

Please see the electronic application form.

Compliance with strategic documents

This project conforms to the overall theme of the strategic objectives laid down by the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Bergen (UoB), where organizing for societal security and crisis management is a prioritized research agenda. The COCOPS project where UoB is a partner (led by Prof. Per Lægreid) focuses on public sector reforms in Europe. The Bergen team has a special responsibility for a Work Package on “Emerging coordinating arrangements in public administration” that are set up to handle wicked problems. This is a further illustration of UoB’s commitment to this topic. Rykkja’s Post doc is financed through this project and is expanded for one year from August 1 2014 assigned to the field of societal security and crisis management. Uni Rokkan Centre’s longstanding research group on “Democracy, welfare and public administration”, where Christensen, Lægreid and Rykkja are affiliated, focuses specifically on governance legitimacy, trust and governance capacity.

Relevance and benefit to society. The project will provide useful knowledge for decision makers, managers and implementers in the public sector in particular, but also in the private sector and civil society. Both political and administrative executives will benefit from the findings. Generally there is a lack of evidence-based knowledge about the effects and implications of different organizational arrangements in this policy area and this project will contribute to improve the means-end knowledge in this field.

Environmental impact. The project has potential to positive environmental impact by strengthening the emergency preparedness and crisis management capacity. We can get better knowledge of how to avoid crisis and catastrophes, how to prepare and mitigate their impacts, how to react adequately when they have occurred and how to adapt afterwards.

Ethical issues. There is no specific ethical question related to this project. The Norwegian Social Science Data Service guarantees for anonymity in the surveys.

Gender issues. Lise H. Rykkja is a core researcher as well as project manager and coordinator in the project. The project will make it possible for her to qualify for a full professorship. The gender balance will be further improved through PhD fellows, research assistants and master students on the program. Julia Fleischer, currently at Freie University in Amsterdam, and listed for an associate professorship position at UoB will be affiliated to the project. Also PhD fellow Christin Watne will be affiliated to the project.

Dissemination plan and Communication with users

The project has an overall comprehensive plan for scientific dissemination and communication with users to promote collaboration and strengthen communication between the research community and the field of practice. Please see the electronic application form for details.

Literature

- Aldrich, D.P. (2012). *Building Resilience: Social Capital in Post Disaster Recovery*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Allison, G.R. (1971). *Essence of decision*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Ansell, C., A. Boin and A. Keller (2010). Managing Transboundary Crises: Identifying Building Blocks of an Effective Response System. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 18 (4): 195-207.
- Bache, I. and M. Flinders (2005). *Multi-level Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boin, A. (2008): Editors Introduction: Fundamentals of Crisis development and Crises Management: An Introduction to Critical Crises. In A. Boin (ed.). *Crisis Management*. Volume I. London: Sage.
- Boin, A., A. Mc Connell and P. 't Hart (eds.) (2008): *Governing after Crisis. The Politics of Investigation, Accountability and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Boin, A., P. 't Hart, E. Stern and B. Sundelius (2005). *The Politics of Crisis Management: Public Leadership under Pressure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boin, A. and M.J.G van Eeten (2013). The resilient organization. *Public Management Review*, 15 (3): 429-445.
- Bouckaert, G., B.G. Peters and K. Verhoest (2010). *The Coordination of Public Sector Organizations*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bossong, R. and H. Hegemann (2013). ANVIL Deliverable 4.1: Synthesis report on comparison of civil security systems.
- Braithwaite, V. and M. Levi (2003). *Trust and Governance*. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.
- Christensen, T., A.L. Fimreite and P. Læg Reid (2009). "Crisis Management – The Perceptions of Citizens and Civil servants in Norway". *Administration & Society*, 43 (5): 561-594.
- Christensen, T. and P. Læg Reid (2007). "The Whole of Government Approach to Public Sector Reform." *Public Administration Review* 67 (6): 1059-1066.
- Christensen, T., P. Læg Reid and L.H. Rykkja (2013): How to Cope with a Terrorist Attack – A Challenge for the Political and Administrative Leadership. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 21 (3): 167-177.
- Christensen, T., P. Læg Reid, P.G. Roness and K.A. Røvik (2007): *Organization Theory and the Public Sector. Instrument, Culture and Myth*. London: Routledge.
- Czarniawska, B. (ed.) (2009). *Organizing in the Age of Risks and Threats*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Danielsen, O. (2013). *Organizing for Crisis Preparedness in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of Primary and Intermediate Institutional Forms*. Working Paper, Department of Administration and Organization Theory.
- Cyert, R.M. and J.G. March (1963). *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Etzioni, A. (2004). *How Patriotic is the Patriot Act? Freedom Versus Security in the Age of Terrorism*. London: Routledge.
- Frendreis, J.P. (1983). "Explanation of variations and Detection of Covariation: The Purpose and the Logic of Comparative Analysis". *Comparative Political Studies*, 16: 255-272.
- Fimreite, A.L., P. Lango, P. Læg Reid and L.H. Rykkja (eds.) (2011): *Organisering, samfunnsikkerhet og krisehåndtering (Organizing, societal security and crisis management)*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Fimreite, A.L., P. Lango, P. Læg Reid and L.H. Rykkja (2012). «22. juli kommisjonen. Organisering, styring og ansvar». *Nordiske Organisasjonsstudier*, 14 (4): 49-58.
- Fimreite, A.L., P. Lango, P. Læg Reid and L.H. Rykkja (2013): «After Oslo and Utøya: A Shift in the Balance Between security and Liberty in Norway?" *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*, 36: 839-856.
- Head, B.W. (2008). "Wicked Problems in Public Policy", *Public Policy*, 3 (2): 101-118.
- Hood, C. (1991). "A Public management for all seasons?" *Public Administration Review*, 69 (Spring): 3-19.
- Hutter, B. and M. Power (2005): *Organizational Encounters with Risk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kettl, D.F. (2003). "Contingent Coordination: Practical and Theoretical Puzzles for Homeland Security". *American Review of Public Administration*, 33 (3): 253-277.
- Krasner, S.D. (1988). "Sovereignty. An Institutional Perspective". *Comparative Political Studies*, 21 (1): 66-94.
- Kuzma, L.M. (2004). "Security versus Liberty", in W. Crotty (ed.), *The Politics of Terror. The U.S. Response to 9/11*. Boston: North Eastern University Press.
- Lango, P., P. Læg Reid and L. H. Rykkja (2013). «Samordning for samfunnsikkerhet: Utviklingen av Justisdepartementets ansvar». *Nordiske Organisasjonsstudier*, 15 (3): 7-33.
- Læg Reid, P., T. Randma-Liiv, L.H. Rykkja and K. Sarapu (2013): "The Governance of Social Cohesion: Innovative Coordinating Practices in Public Management. Report. COCOPS. Work Package 5.
- Mahoney, J. and K. Thelen (2010). *Explaining Institutional Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- March, J.G. and J.P. Olsen (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions*. New York: The Free Press.
- NOU 2012:14. *Rapport fra 22.July Commission*. Oslo: Ministry of Justice and Public Security.
- NOU 9: 2013 *Ett politi – rustet til å møte fremtidens utfordringer*. Oslo: Ministry of Justice and Public Security.
- Olsen, J.P. (2010). *Governing through Institution Building*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Olsen, J.P. (2014). *Folkestyrets varige spenninger (Permanet tension in democracy)*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Osborne, S.P. (ed.) 2009. *The New Public Governance: Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*. London: Routledge.
- Perrow, C.2006. "The Limits of Safety: The Enhancement of a Theory of Accidents". In D. Smith and D. Elliot (eds.): *Key Readings in Crisis Management*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Pollitt, C. (2003). "Joined-up Government: A Survey". *Political Studies Review* (1) 1: 34-49.
- Provan, K.G. and P. Kenis (2007). "Modes of Network Governance: Structure, Management, and Effectiveness". *JPART*, 18: 229-252.
- Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in Organizations*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Simon, H. (1957). *Administrative Behavior*. New York: The Free Press.
- Streek, W. and K. Thelen (2005). *Beyond Continuity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Weick, K. and K. Sutcliffe (2001). *Managing Unexpected: resilient Performance in the Age of Uncertainty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wildavsky, A. (1988): *Searching for Safety*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.